

103D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 194

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the proposed tax increase on social security benefits should not be enacted and if enacted should be repealed.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 10, 1993

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CANADY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. KING, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KYL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means

RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the proposed tax increase on social security benefits should not be enacted and if enacted should be repealed.

Whereas the House of Representatives has narrowly passed President Clinton's budget proposal;

Whereas a diverse of coalition of senior citizen groups, along with the vast majority of grassroots seniors nationwide, are opposed to the social security tax increase included in the budget;

Whereas over 9,000,000 social security recipients will be adversely affected by a social security tax increase proposal;

Whereas those affected by this taxation will pay on average an extra \$483 per year;

Whereas without an inflation adjustment, the percentage of affected seniors who are in effect taxed twice on the same income will rise significantly in 5 years;

Whereas the social security tax proposal is the only part of the President's plan which concedes to be a targeted tax increase on a segment of the middle class;

Whereas many fixed income senior citizens cannot be without these much-needed benefits in this current economic climate;

Whereas senior citizens have historically shared a heavy burden and been the target of numerous measures, such as a freeze in their cost-of-living adjustment and the implementation of the social security tax; and

Whereas such a tax increase would affect not only current middle- and upper-class senior citizens but also millions of future social security beneficiaries: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Rep-
 2 resentatives that the proposed increase in tax on social
 3 security benefits should not be enacted and if enacted
 4 should be repealed.

○